

4 = Outstanding
 3 = Very Good
 2 = Acceptable
 1 = Limitations
 0 = Serious Limitations

EVALUATION FORM

3051 - Lafayette Library

Overall Rating

4

Ratings Summary

<i>BOND ACT CRITERIA</i>	<i>RATING</i>	
Population Growth		34%
Age and Condition	3	
Needs of residents/response of proposed project to needs	4	
Plan of service integrates appropriate technology	4	
Appropriateness of site	4	
Financial capacity (new libraries only)		yes

Non-Evaluative Comments

None.

Project Summary

<i>Applicant:</i>	Lafayette, City of
<i>Library Jurisdiction:</i>	Contra Costa County Library
<i>Project Type/Priority</i>	New Construction of Library/1
<i>Project Square Footage:</i>	25,453
<i>State Grant Request:</i>	\$11,880,531

4 = Outstanding
 3 = Very Good
 2 = Acceptable
 1 = Limitations
 0 = Serious Limitations

EVALUATION FORM

3051 - Lafayette Library

Age and Condition of Existing Library

Regulatory Basis: 20440, Appendices 1 & 3

RATING

3

Age Rating

4 = No Existing Facility
 4 = 1949 or older
 3 = 1950-1959
 2 = 1960-1964
 1 = 1965-1974
 0 = 1975-2003

R1	R2	R3
2	2	2

Structural Renovation Rating

4 = No Renovation
 4 = 1954 & earlier
 3 = 1955-1962
 2 = 1963-1972
 1 = 1973-1978
 0 = 1979-2003

R1	R2	R3
4	4	4

4 = Extremely Poor Condition
 3 = Poor condition
 2 = Acceptable condition
 1 = Good condition
 0 = Very good condition

Condition of Existing Library

1. Structural
 2. Lighting
 3. Energy
 4. Health & Safety
 5. ADA
 6. Acoustical
 7. Flexibility
 8. Spatial Relationships
 9. Site Considerations

R1	R2	R3
4	4	4
3	3	2
3	4	3
3	4	3
4	4	4
3	4	3
3	3	3
4	3	3
3	3	3

Rating panel comments

Library construction date: 1962
 Library renovation date: None

4 = Outstanding
3 = Very Good
2 = Acceptable
1 = Limitations
0 = Serious Limitations

EVALUATION FORM

3051 - Lafayette Library

R1:

The library has served the community for 42 years without any major renovations or improvements. The building does not meet structural building code requirements or the functional requirements of a modern library. Major structural upgrades are required to bring the building up to code. All connections between beams and columns require strengthening to meet seismic requirements. The exterior walls have dry rot. The exterior window walls on both the east and west faces of the lower building also require rebuilding due to excessive weathering. There is poor energy conservation due to inefficient fluorescent lighting, an outdated HVAC system, poor glazing and inadequate insulation. The windows are not insulated, experience significant heat loss in winter, and leak cooled air in the summer. The fluorescent lighting is outdated and does not meet current requirements, nor does the mounting height of light switches meet ADA requirements. There are not enough electrical outlets in areas convenient for staff or patrons to use for electronic devices. Asbestos must be removed from ceilings and walls. Worn and frayed carpeting, much of it dating back to 1962, creates a tripping hazard, as do snaking cables and wires. The potential for fire is great due to the lack of any automatic sprinkler systems or fire alarm systems. The building is not in compliance with minimum ADA requirements, including doorways, hallways, stack space, restrooms, and fixtures. The large T-shape floor plan with its high ceilings and hard interior surfaces causes sounds to bounce and reflect. There are no acoustically buffered areas, and this deficiency has created unacceptable high levels of noise throughout the library. The extreme lack of space within the building, together with the overuse of the space, creates numerous examples of non-functional spatial relationships. The Library has poor visibility and it is difficult to access by automobile. With only 46 parking stalls and poor parking lot circulation, traffic congestion occurs both on- and off-site.

R2:

Although this single story, 6720 square foot building is half the size needed to serve its population, no major renovation or improvements have been undertaken. This building has serious structural deficiencies that require major upgrade to meet current seismic code. The wood frame underneath the veneer exterior has substantial dry rot. The building is outdated and in an advanced stage of deterioration with most systems being at the end of their useful life. The HVAC, electrical and lighting are all well advanced in years and operational value. Asbestos is present in the ceiling and walls and multiple health & safety and ADA violations exist throughout the facility. The building is further characterized by low energy performance, space is not designed in an efficient flexible way and the site lacks adequate visibility and has drainage problems.

R3:

This is a single story 6,720 SF building that is 42 years old. The city had a study done to evaluate the library and the end result was that it was not even rated to be adequate for general office space due to seismic considerations. There is a poor electrical system and old HVAC system. There is no sprinkler or fire alarm system. Asbestos is present in several areas. Structural leaks have led to a major case of dry rot in the walls. Since the building is trying to serve a population that has doubled the spatial relations in areas just do not work anymore. There are numerous health & safety and ADA issues.

4 = Outstanding
 3 = Very Good
 2 = Acceptable
 1 = Limitations
 0 = Serious Limitations

EVALUATION FORM

3051 - Lafayette Library

Needs and Response to Needs

Regulatory Basis: 20440 pp. 26, 27, 60-69

RATING

4

Community Library Needs Assessment

1. Methodology & community involvement.
2. Community analysis/community agencies & organizations, service area demographics
3. Analysis of service needs/consistency with demographics
4. Service limitations for existing facility (if applicable)
5. Space needs assessment
6. Executive summary includes description of K-12 student population and their needs

R1	R2	R3
4	4	4
4	4	4
3	3	3
4	4	4
3	3	3
3	3	3

Library Plan of Service

7. How well project responds to needs of residents
8. How well project responds to needs of K-12 students as expressed in Needs Assessment
9. How well mission, roles, goals, objectives, service indicators are documented
10. How well types of services are documented
11. How well types of K-12 services are documented
12. How project fits into jurisdiction-wide Plan of Service

R1	R2	R3
4	4	4
4	4	4
3	3	4
4	4	4
4	4	4
4	4	4

Library Building Program

13. How well Building Program implements Plan of Service.
14. How well Building Program documents general requirements for Library Building.
15. How well spatial relationships are described.
16. How well individual spaces are sized and described.

R1	R2	R3
4	4	4
4	4	4
4	4	4
4	3	4

Conceptual Plans

17. How well net-assignable SF on plan matches Building Program
18. How well non-assignable SF on plan matches Building Program
19. How well spatial relationships on plan match Building Program

R1	R2	R3
4	4	4
4	4	4
4	4	4

Joint Use Cooperative Agreement

20. How well roles & responsibilities are defined.
21. How clearly joint library services are described.
22. Appropriateness, adequacy, reasonableness of hours of service.
23. Appropriateness, adequacy, reasonableness of staffing/volunteers.
24. How well ownership issues are resolved
25. Appropriateness, adequacy, reasonableness of sources & uses of funding
26. Appropriateness, adequacy, reasonableness of review & modification process
27. How well agreement demonstrates a workable, mutually beneficial long-term partnership.

R1	R2	R3
3	3	3
3	3	3
4	4	4
2	2	2
3	3	3
4	4	4
2	3	2
3	4	3

4 = Outstanding
3 = Very Good
2 = Acceptable
1 = Limitations
0 = Serious Limitations

EVALUATION FORM

3051 - Lafayette Library

Rating Panel Comments

R1:

NEEDS ASSESSMENT

Applicant has utilized a variety of techniques to gather input from the community. They included: Library in-house survey (2000); 11 focus groups; 27 key informant interviews; charettes for library design; survey completed by students, parents, teachers, librarians, school administrators (2003). Copies of the survey are included in an appendix along with results (compilations) of results from the focus groups, key informant interviews, school input. Have provided an excellent community analysis that includes extensive input from community organizations. Service needs are listed, however it would have been helpful to have described the relationship between proposed services and findings in the needs assessment. Space needs assessment was clear; however, information about current status was not included but rationale for number of computers was not included. It is evident from the presentation that services for children and youth are a priority in this community.

PLAN OF SERVICE

Two service roles were identified (active learning center; hub of community and civic activity). Four client and library- centered roles formed the foundation for the plan of service. Some of the service indicators are somewhat client-centered as are some of the activities, but the objectives were not measurable. Have done an excellent job at providing documentation for each of the proposed services. Have done an excellent job at describing library services provided by the county, but have demonstrated what the proposed library will provide for the jurisdiction.

BUILDING PROGRAM

An excellent general requirements section both in terms of comprehensiveness and detail.
An excellent description of the library's spatial relationships both in narrative and graphic form.
Outstanding and extremely well detailed space descriptions that appear to be appropriately sized.

CONCEPTUAL PLANS

The building program requires 20,175 net assignable square footage for the main, middle and lower levels, or 76% of the 26,545 gross square footage. The floor plans provide 20,358 net assignable square footage for the levels, or 76% of the 26,761 gross square footage. In comparison to the building program, the floor plans have provided more square footage than required in three program spaces, and less square footage than required in one program space. These spaces are:

Exhibit Gallery/Display, 57 sq ft. more than required, or a 22% surplus in square footage.
Group Study Room A, 20 sq ft. more than required, or a 17% surplus in square footage.
Lafayette Historical Society Closed Storage, 97 sq ft. more than required, or a 45% surplus in square footage.
Information Desk, 37 sq ft. less than required, or a 17% deficit in square footage.

The floor plans have met program square footage requirements in an exceptional manner for both assignable and non-assignable square footage.

Despite minor differences in the spatial relationships between the floor plans and the building program, the spatial relationships illustrated on the floor plans follow building program requirements in an exceptional manner. The differences are:

Group Study Room B & C are not in sight lines from Information Desk. (BP 66/145)
Periodicals and Newspapers and Lafayette Heritage Collection are not quite far away from Homework Center. (BP 92/145)
Lafayette Historical Society Closed Storage is not adjacent to Lafayette Historical Society Room. (BP 141/145)

JOINT USE AGREEMENT

This is a four way partnering effort between the Contra Costa County Library, City of Lafayette, Lafayette School District, and the Acalanes Union High School District. Roles and responsibilities are clearly delineated for each party and it seems that the library has the largest portion of the duties. Services consist of a series of programs that may be held at various times of the year (i.e. multi-generational music performance program, etc.) along with a homework center. Although a technology lab is mentioned in various places including the Building Program (pg. 89--room to be designed to offer public access computer equipment both for technology training and for public access to word processing and is one component of the Joint Venture Cooperative Agreement), there is no mention of it in the agreement. Proposed hours of service for the Homework Center (K-12) are excellent (M-F 2:30-9:00; Sat 10:00-6:00). there is limited mention of hours for other proposed services. There is a list of library staff positions for the library and there is a .5FTE Homework Center Coordinator that is being provided by the library, however there does not seem to be any commitment from any of the other partners. Funding levels are clearly defined with specific amounts of in-kind contributions from all of the partners.

4 = Outstanding
3 = Very Good
2 = Acceptable
1 = Limitations
0 = Serious Limitations

EVALUATION FORM

3051 - Lafayette Library

for the Homework Center Coordinator that is being provided by the library, however there does not seem to be any commitment from any of the other partners. Funding levels are clearly defined with specific amounts of in-kind contributions from all of the partners. The review and modification process for the agreement will be done on an annual basis by a Program Review Board--library and school staff members who deliver the services will meet on a quarterly basis. Unable to determine what, if any, input there will be from the users. A partnering effort that has the potential of becoming permanent.

4 = Outstanding
3 = Very Good
2 = Acceptable
1 = Limitations
0 = Serious Limitations

EVALUATION FORM

3051 - Lafayette Library

R2:

NEEDS ASSESSMENT

They used varied tools, reaching a large portion of the community through recent surveys, focus groups, design reviews, and key informant interviews. All were, apparently, conducted in English, which is realistic given the community demographics. They provided copies of surveys and questions addressed in the various methods, along with excellent summary results as well as detailed compilations in appendices. The community analysis provided an excellent discussion of agencies, schools, organizations, demographics, and community characteristics, with clear connections to potential implications of those characteristics for future library services in the new facility. The service needs analysis did an excellent job of clearly defining service needs for four different groups of constituencies in different categories. What is missing is specific connections between those defined needs and individual results of the various needs assessment tools. Much of the information came out in the needs methodology section, but, as this is now, it is left to the reader to make those connections to each of the dozens of needs defined in the six and one half page listing here. Clearly the existing 6700 square foot facility provides severe service and physical limitations for the 24,000-person service population. The executive summary provided a very good summary of the effort and plans for the library but very little description of the K-12 student population and needs.

PLAN OF SERVICE

The goals are definitely user-centered; the objectives are not, nor are they generally measurable. None of the service indicators is outcomes-based. Taken altogether, however, these do define a project which responds quite well to the defined needs and, combined with the Implementation section, do an excellent job of documenting very responsive services for the community as a whole and the K-12 student population.

BUILDING PROGRAM

With the exception of some electronic technologies issues, which are discussed in that section of the evaluation, the building program does an excellent job of implementing the plan of service. The general requirements provided excellent basic design considerations for library facilities in general, with sufficient and appropriate focus on the specifics of the environment, siting, etc. of the Lafayette branch to provide an excellent, overall guide to the design team. Spatial relationships are logical. There are some inconsistencies between some spatial pairs (e.g., sightlines or proximity specified at one end while adjacency is specified at the other). These inconsistencies, however, were few and not terribly significant overall. Some "Away" relationships would probably be a helpful specification. The spaces are sized well, although often at the lower end of standard sizing ranges. Specifications regarding access for the disabled are very basic in the general requirements, primarily just pointing to "guidelines set forth in ADA," without even providing any citations to the many publications discussing these as they specifically relate to libraries. The space descriptions are equally general and do not accurately reflect the plan of service provision that "All of the computer workstations in the LL&LC meet or exceed ADA guidelines." (p. 37); p. 98 of the building program, for instance, specifies "one (of 6) computer workstations needs to support the needs of visually impaired and hearing impaired..."

CONCEPTUAL PLANS

Net-assignable space on the plans matches the building program extremely well.

Non-assignable space on the plans matches what was called for in the building program extremely well.

The conceptual plan meets the spatial relationships called for in the building program exceptionally well with a few exceptions:

It does not appear that the sight line from the Accounts Desk to the Homework Center has been maintained.

It does not appear that the staff can monitor the service counter from their desks behind the counter (presumably in the workroom).

The sight lines from the Information Desk to the Homework Center, some of the Group Study Rooms and some areas within the Children's Library, have not been maintained, however most of the critical sightlines called for in the program have been accomplished.

The Teen Area is not adjacent to the Homework Center, but it is very close.

The Historical Society's Closed Storage is not adjacent to the Historical Society Room, but it is close.

4 = Outstanding
3 = Very Good
2 = Acceptable
1 = Limitations
0 = Serious Limitations

EVALUATION FORM

3051 - Lafayette Library

Overall, the architect did an outstanding job a meeting the program's spatial relationship requirements!

JOINT USE AGREEMENT

The roles and responsibilities of the four parties are very well defined, but those of the library seem much more active than those of the other partners. The services are very clear and should prove very useful to K-12 students and the population at large. No discussion of the Technology Center or its role in any of the services was provided, however. Hours of service for the branch are excellent, as are those for the Homework Center, defined on page 2. The hours for the other services are less clear but are defined in their service descriptions, as twice weekly, quarterly, weekly, annually, etc. Staffing is indicated for the entire library, not specifically for the joint use services themselves and only from the county and city, not any estimated for the other partners' efforts. Some indication of staffing levels from all partners can be intuited from the funding section, but the number and classification of staff for the joint use services is certainly not clear. Funding is clearly being contributed, mostly in-kind, from all parties for the joint use services. Quarterly review meetings feed into formal annual reviews based on service indicators defined in the plan of service and baseline data collected initially. The degree of user participation in the review process is unclear. There is clear interest in this endeavor shown on the part of all participants. It should provide valuable services to the people of Lafayette for many years to come.

4 = Outstanding
3 = Very Good
2 = Acceptable
1 = Limitations
0 = Serious Limitations

EVALUATION FORM

3051 - Lafayette Library

R3:

NEEDS ASSESSMENT

The needs assessment process included extensive public notification about events related to the planning process for a proposed new library. A variety of input methods was used to gather input from approximately 4,000 residents over an eight-year period, including eleven focus groups, interviews with 27 community leaders, an in-house survey conducted by the Friends, survey of parents, students and school staff conducted by library staff. In addition other surveys were used to gauge community support for improved library services. In addition, there was considerable amount of community input concerning the selection of both the site and the architectural firm and commenting on the conceptual design, demonstrating a strong connection between the library and the community it serves that will result in community partnerships. The community analysis is thorough, detailed, and well organized, and includes analysis of a variety of relevant community factors that will affect the nature of the services in the new library. Analysis of library service needs are well done and consistent with the needs assessment findings. The service limitations of the current facility are clear, supporting basic service needs by comparing the current service areas to recognized standards. The space needs assessment sites rationale and standards used to determine the collection size and the number of readers' seats, but none is given for public access computers. Conversion factors used appear to be appropriate and to provide adequate square footage.

PLAN OF SERVICE

The services planned correlate to the needs assessment findings, making insightful translations into library services. The plan itself is clear, thorough and written in a way that will be very useful to those who will be planning and implementing the services. It's well organized, and rationale for each objective is given, which further clarifies the service intent. Goals are user oriented. A section within each objective ties it directly back to the needs assessment findings. Service indicators include qualitative measures via feedback or rating by participants. The plan includes activities under each objective, taking initial steps toward the actual implementation of the services.

BUILDING PROGRAM

The building program flows from the needs assessment and plan of service, providing spaces as called for and that are consistent with their intended uses. The general requirements section is thorough and should provide the design team with information that will enable it to design the building according to the community needs. Individual space sheets are well done, providing particularly good descriptions of the activities to take place in the spaces, which should help assist the design team in developing an understanding of the type and level of activity to occur in the space. In general an outstanding, well written building program.

Revisions that would improve the document have to do with a final read-through to ensure alignment and coordination of the pieces of the program and to ensure the desired outcome (e.g., the general requirements section calls for a three-position desk: two for circulation functions and one for information transactions, but the spatial relationships and individual space sheets show two separate, adjacent desks with the two services with inconsistent information in the listing of furnishings; including all furnishings in the section labeled "Components" to ensure they are not omitted during purchasing (e.g., phones aren't listed, and chairs appear to be missing from several areas, including the technology lab, children's computers, and homework center); and the somewhat confusing inclusion of decimal fractions when referring to the number of shelving units required in an area -- leaving the "round-up or round-down" decision to the design team could result in unexpected results).

CONCEPTUAL PLANS:

The plan was extremely well done with the exception of two small errors in labeling for the information desk and the adult fiction area.

The non-assignable SF in the building program called for 24% and the plan delivered 24% which is quite appropriate for this building.

The spatial relations were extremely well done. There were virtually no questions on the clearly shown data. There was only one questionable section in 3.3: the information desk has a questionable line of sight to the study rooms which appear to be enclosed, leaving them out of the line of sight.

JOINT USE AGREEMENT

While the number of hours that the homework center is open are excellent (Monday through Friday from 2:30 p.m. to 9:00 p.m. (closing) and 10:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. on Saturday), the amount of assistance to be provided during those hours is not specified. There will be staff members dedicated to coordinating services and programs, but the number of tutors and staff on duty to assist students is not mentioned. Funding commitments are very clear, with the levels of service are translated into their estimated dollar values. The review and modification process is somewhat unclear. There is a program review board, a committee comprised of one

4 = Outstanding
3 = Very Good
2 = Acceptable
1 = Limitations
0 = Serious Limitations

EVALUATION FORM

3051 - Lafayette Library

agreement is not mentioned. Funding commitments are very clear, that the levels of service are translated into their estimated dollar values. The review and modification process is somewhat unclear. There is a program review board, a committee comprised of one member from each of the participating parties, which will make annual recommendations made to the "Partners." These recommendations appear to be based solely on the amount of use of the joint venture services and an annual user survey distributed to all residents. Another section of the agreement indicates that those charged with planning and implementing the services will meet "quarterly, or as needed, to review and modify activities." It's not clear from the agreement what modifications can occur without approval by the signing parties. In addition, gathering information from users of each of the services more often than quarterly would enable more timely modification of programs to ensure they are meeting the users' needs. This type of service indicator was mentioned in the service plan, but did not carried over to the agreement. While one of the parties, the high school district, is to provide very little to the agreement, it appears that there is significant participation by the other three parties and this should prove to be a mutually beneficial partnership for them.

4 = Outstanding
 3 = Very Good
 2 = Acceptable
 1 = Limitations
 0 = Serious Limitations

EVALUATION FORM

3051 - Lafayette Library

Integration of Electronic Technologies

RATING

4

Regulatory Basis: p.68, 20440, Appendix 4

Integration of Electronic Technologies

1. Appropriateness of electronic technologies in Plan of Service, based on Needs Assessment
2. How well the integration of electronic technologies is documented in Plan of Service
3. How well the integration of electronic technologies is documented in the Building Program

R1	R2	R3
4	3	4
4	4	4
3	3	4

Rating Panel Comments

R1:

The proposed services are responsive to identified needs. This plan integrates technology as a critical element in the delivery of library services. There will be 42 computers (26 in open area, and this includes 10 in the children's area; 10 in the technology lab, 4 in the Homework Center and 2 in the teen area). The building will be "wireless friendly," and there will be laptop and wireless access throughout the building. Have done an excellent job at including technology components for each of the service goals (i.e. reader's advisory, Library Arts and Science Discovery Center, etc.). Online service technology will be used for continuous evaluation of data (ability to generate user and non-user surveys and to analyze data). Specific examples of databases for students, seniors, etc., are provided.

R2:

The electronic technologies clearly addressed the needs defined in the needs assessment, but the presentation did not do as good a job of showing that planning for future technological advancements was well integrated. This planning did not seem to include provision for the wireless access for the public and staff called for on page 105 of the needs assessment. The plan did include an excellent array of support technologies both for the public and the staff, with many specific examples of software and databases proposed to assist these. The presentation was focused on solutions for the public, not just technologies for technology's sake. Electronic technologies are integrated into the building program pretty well, with the exception of some confusion regarding computer work stations and implementation of wireless. The Preliminary Master List of Furniture and Equipment (Appendix E) specifies 15 laptop computers in a mobile computer lab, which is not called for in the needs assessment nor plan of service and does not show up in any of the spaces. In addition, the numbers of staff and public computers in the Master List do not match the sums of computers from the individual spaces. Finally, while the general requirements indicate the library is to support wireless connectivity throughout, as called for in the needs assessment, and several spaces also call for this capability, there appears to be no equipment in the Master List to support that capability. These discrepancies should be resolved before moving forward.

R3:

The planning documents demonstrate a thorough understanding of the uses of technology in providing library service solutions. The goals and objectives of the service plan incorporate specific service solutions to be provided by types or titles of software and/or other electronic resources. In addition, the separate technology section focuses on the service area and provides additional detail concerning electronic resources. In addition to a homework center with four PCs, there will be a technology lab with 10 PCs, which will be used for a variety of activities, including individual student access reference/homework-related resources, class visits, information literacy classes, and for specific library programs targeted at academic subject areas (e.g., reading and math). The general requirements section of the building program calls for wireless technology to enable use of library-owned portable devices as well as user-owned devices and will maximize flexibility for future needs. The circulation area will include automated check-in and sorting equipment, which should serve to reduce the amount of time required to return materials to the shelves.

4 = Outstanding
 3 = Very Good
 2 = Acceptable
 1 = Limitations
 0 = Serious Limitations

EVALUATION FORM

3051 - Lafayette Library

Site

RATING

4

Regulatory Basis: p.39, 20440, Appendix 1

Appropriateness of Site

1. Equal access for all residents in service area.
2. Accessibility via public transit.
3. Accessibility via pedestrian and bicycle.
4. Accessibility via automobile.
5. Adequacy of automobile parking.
6. Adequacy of bicycle parking.
7. Overall parking rationale.
8. Shared parking agreement (if applicable).
9. Visibility of site & proposed library building in service area
10. How well site fits community context & planning
11. Site selection process and summary.

R1	R2	R3
4	4	4
4	4	4
4	4	4
4	4	4
4	4	4
4	4	4
4	4	4
N/A		
4	4	4
4	4	4
4	4	4

Site Description

12. Adequacy of size of site.
13. Appropriateness of site configuration
14. Appropriateness of site/surrounding area.
15. Appropriateness of site based on placement of building, parking, access roads, pathways, expansion and parking.

R1	R2	R3
3	3	3
3	3	3
4	4	4
2	2	2

Rating Panel Comments

Drainage issues: OK

Geotechnical issues: The site is not within a Special Fault Zone but is within 5 miles of an active fault. There are no conditions which will prevent or significantly increase the cost of the development of the site.

R1:

The Lafayette Library is in the geographic center of the city at the intersection of Mt. Diablo Blvd. (city's main arterial) and First Street (second busiest intersection of the city) within the downtown redevelopment project area. It is .07 miles from the Bay Area Rapid Transit System (BART) and is a few hundred feet from the city's largest senior housing complex. There are 4 elementary, 1 middle, and 1 high school within walking distance of the site (furthest away is 2 miles) and it is across the street from the First Street Multi-Use Plan, pedestrian and bicycle route that travels by the elementary school, middle school and connects with the regional Lafayette Moraga Trail. There are 8 public transit stops within 1/4 mile of the site with one stop in front of the site and one across the street-- Mt. Diablo Blvd. is a major bus route for the city. Access to State Route 24 is within 1/4 mile from the site. The site is surrounded by sidewalks which connect the location to the downtown area. There are numerous bicycle lanes and paths with pedestrian access to 2 public plazas, an outdoor amphitheater, and a reading court. There will be 20 covered bicycle parking spaces available at the library. There are 86 on-site parking spaces (no requirement) for a total of 217 spaces which include those in the 2 level parking garage under the building. The site selection process included consideration of 12 other sites with a list of criteria used to narrow the choice. There were 16 community meetings held to gather input from the community. In the Needs Assessment portion of the application is a matrix with information about the site selection process.

4 = Outstanding
3 = Very Good
2 = Acceptable
1 = Limitations
0 = Serious Limitations

EVALUATION FORM

3051 - Lafayette Library

R2:

The proposed site is centrally located in the library service area. It is located on Mt. Diablo Blvd (38,470 vehicles per day) which is the major east/west commercial thoroughfare in the city. This site is also 2 blocks from Moraga Road which has 28,475 vehicles per day and is also a major thoroughfare.

The proposed library site is only .7 miles from a Bart station and has 8 public transit sites within 1/4 mile of the site.

There are 20 covered bike parking spaces fairly near the front entrance.

There are 86 on-site parking spaces and another 131 on-street spaces within 500' of the front door. Some of the parking will require a fair hike to get to the library's front entrance.

The site is highly visible on Mt. Diablo Blvd.

The site is within the Lafayette Redevelopment Project area.

An extremely well documented site selection study with public input, consideration of alternative sites and a detailed description of the criteria used.

A plan for the expansion of the building is shown on site plan, but it will potentially take up parking spaces unless parking spaces are added under the building expansion. Further, it appears the expansion would interfere with the entry to the existing parking structure.

R3:

The Lafayette Library is central in the city on Mt. Diablo Blvd, a block from a major intersection with its civic plaza, local shopping, and access to BART. The local bus service focuses on Mt. Diablo Blvd. Bike paths and lanes, sidewalks, etc. are all present. 20 covered bike slots are provided. Auto access is just off Mt. Diablo, or off Fwy. 24 a block away. Onsite and offsite parking is more than adequate.

The 30' roof will be visible from BART as well as Mt. Diablo and the civic plaza a block away. The glazed facade will be prominent. The site fits community prominence, centrality and access requirements. Extensive review of many sites by various groups narrowed the number to three, and a citizen-involved group settled on this site.

The site is 2-1/2X the footprint, enough for the footprint and underground parking. The site is a rectangle with a small rectangle attached on Golden Gate Way. The building as proposed works well, although the separate meeting facility may be inefficient, with a duplicate set of bathrooms, vestibule, etc., and thus inhibits maximum exploitation of the site. The proposed expansion seems to use parking spaces and the garage entry.

4 = Outstanding
3 = Very Good
2 = Acceptable
1 = Limitations
0 = Serious Limitations

EVALUATION FORM

3051 - Lafayette Library

Financial Capacity

Regulatory Basis: Bond Act p. 5, Section 19998 (a) (7)

Rating Panel Comments:

Applicant has committed to the on-going operation of the completed library.